

NOV 20 2006

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 25, 2006 and the Examiner Interview of November 1, 2006. Applicant acknowledges with thanks Examiner Zhen's assistance in granting an interview on November 1, 2006, during the course of which interview various features of the claimed embodiments were discussed, the substance of which is included herein.

Claims 1-16 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16. The present Reply cancels claims 1-3, 7, and 9, replaces claims 4-5, 8, 10, 13, and 16, and adds new claim 17, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 4-6, 8, and 10-17. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

I. Summary of Examiner's Objections/Rejections

The Title was objected to as being non-descriptive.

Claims 3, 8 and 9 were objected to due to informalities.

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite and lacking sufficient antecedent basis.

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-9 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/706,515.

Claims 10-16 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10, 13 and 16 of copending Application No. 10/706,515 in view of Dattke et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0143835).

- 7 -

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01339US3
tplunkett/beas/1339us3/1339us3.ReplyA.doc

Claims 1-7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Glass (U.S. Patent No. 6,993,774).

Claims 8 and 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass in view of Dattke et al.

II. Response to Rejections

A Terminal Disclaimer is attached to this Reply to overcome the rejection for nonstatutory double patenting.

The claims were amended to better define embodiments of Applicant's invention.

Independent Claim 17 states:

A method for dynamically generating a wrapper object, comprising:
receiving a resource adapter class at an application server;
performing reflection on the resource adapter class to identify interfaces implemented by the resource adapter class;
dynamically generating a wrapper class at runtime that extends from a superclass, wherein the superclass implements Java Database Connectivity, Java Messaging Service, or Java Connector Architecture interfaces, and the wrapper class implements the interfaces identified through reflection;
instantiating a wrapper object from the wrapper class; and
providing the wrapper object to an application that requires support for the interfaces implemented by the resource adapter class.

Independent Claim 17 defines a computer program product that carries instructions for dynamically generating a wrapper object that will allow applications to access extension features of third-party resource adapters in addition to allowing the application server to monitor the activities between the applications and the resource adapters. A wrapper object is generated dynamically at runtime by using reflection to identify the interfaces that a resource adapter class implements, then creating a wrapper class that implements all of the interfaces identified through reflection. Some interfaces will be J2EE interfaces for JDBC, JMS, or JCA, for which access will be gained through a

superclass. The wrapper class will be created to implement non-standard vendor-specific extension interfaces, and it will inherit standard interfaces from the superclass.

Glass (U.S. Patent No. 6,993,774) describes using reflection to generate a remote proxy for use in client-side communications between a client application and a server object. Glass does not describe a superclass that implements interfaces for JDBC, JMS, or JCA.

Dattke (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0143835) describes Business Add-Ins, a method for allowing application extensions to be written for SAP without modifying the standard SAP application. Dattke only supports generating extension classes for a single vendor (SAP), whereas applicant's invention supports generating wrapper objects for a wide range of data resources, any data resource that supports JDBC, JMS, or JCA.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 17 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Glass and Dattke.

Independent claim 10 is believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with claim 17. Dependent claims 4-6, 8, and 11-16 are also believed to be patentable for the reasons above. It is also submitted that claims 4-6, 8, and 11-16 also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, November 20, 2006.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 20, 2006

By: _____



Thomas K. Plunkett
Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928